DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 004 EA 006 934

AUTHOR	Runkel, Philip J.; Bell, Warren E.
TITLE	Some Conditions Affecting Organizational Processes in Schools -- Second Installment.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	31 Mar 75
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (60th, Washington, D. C., March 31-April 4, 1975)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Communication Skills; *Consultation Programs; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Dynamics; Inservice Programs; Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Relationship; Measurement Techniques; Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; *Questionnaires; *Readiness

ABSTRACT

This paper examines two main questions: what indicators of staff readiness are useful in planning an organizational consultation with a school staff, and how evidence of those indicators can be effectively gathered. Based on experience in past consultations with various school staffs, it is concluded that a school is likely to benefit from organizational development consultation if the staff is willing to undergo four or more days of initial training, if staff members are able to communicate in emotional situations, and if some type of collaborative organizational innovation has been attempted at the school fairly recently. Included in the paper are samples of survey instruments suitable for gathering data about the various indicators of staff readiness. (JG)

EA | SP

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED104004

EA 006 934

SOME CONDITIONS AFFECTING ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESSES IN SCHOOLS -- SECOND INSTALLMENT

Philip J. Runkel and Warren E. Bell

Paper for session 6.13 of the convention of the AERA, 31 March 1975

Brooklyn Derr's invitation to tell about some recent findings about OD in schools came to us at a moment when we were in the midst of tabulating large masses of evidence about the effects of consultation and training in schools. One monograph, just published, will tell the story of the way we used techniques of OD to help six elementary schools convert from self-contained classrooms to team teaching and differentiated staffing (Schmuck, Murray, Smith, Schwartz, and Runkel, 1975). Another monograph, now in manuscript, will tell the story of the first cadre of organizational specialists in a school district and the kind of work they did in helping schools and district to solve organizational problems (Runkel, Wyant, Bell, and others, 1975).

We might have chosen, for this symposium, to display for you our most recent evidence on the benefits of OD to schools. We shall not do that. We do not believe it is any longer news that the methods of OD can aid schools in solving their organizational problems more effectively than schools routinely do. In any case, evidence from our recent work concerning sheer impact will soon be available in print. A more important question in 1975, we think, is this: What are

---

The research reported here was funded by grants and contracts from NIE and USOE of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official NIE or USOE position or policy.

some organizational conditions or processes that make it more likely or less likely for schools to profit from OD training?

Last year at AERA, we told about two conditions that indicated a readiness on the part of schools for profiting from OD training (Runkel, 1974). Today, we want to tell you about some further findings concerning the readiness of schools to learn new ways of conceiving and managing certain of their own organizational processes.

For today's paper, we have selected three findings that bear upon some questions organizational consultants often ask. If we had chosen only one, we could of course have taken more time to tell you the details of the analysis of the data. But we want to open up for discussion, both here and in other places, the matter of diagnosis: what indicators can be useful to the consultant in deciding where to start in giving organizational consultation to a school -- or in deciding whether to start at all? And how can evidence be gathered concerning the diagnostic indicators? It seems to us that three examples will serve our purpose better than one detailed finding. Consequently, we are offering you today three very brief papers, so to speak, instead of one.

Communication, Openness, and Responsiveness

One question we have often discussed with our colleagues is this: what skills in a school staff are needed to get the staff ready to take collaborative action? A special form of this question has been argued in the literature for some years; namely, what is necessary for new collaborative action: is it the ability of

organizational members to communicate in emotional situations -- that is, to continue to discuss interpersonal conflicts despite being emotionally aroused -- or is it the sheer opening of channels and contacts to increase the circulation of information generally, or is it some conbination of these?

We collected data on this question in the elementary schools of a school district near Seattle during the years 1968 to 1972. Using items on a questionnaire administered four times in five years, we built three tests.

Test A on communication during emotion consisted of four items asking the staff member whether other staff members in the school might be expected to continue communicating even though they felt hurt or put down, though they found themselves in a meeting where people were describing their emotions, and though they found themselves in the presence of a hot argument between others.

Test B on openness of interpersonal channels asked whether members of the school would be likely to seek out others to continue talking about a disagreement, how many others they could name with whom they talked seriously at least once a week about things important to them, and how many others like this the principal could name.

Test C on responsiveness was our indicator of readiness to take collaborative action. To make it concrete, we described a hypothetical teacher who wanted to improve his classroom teaching, and asked three items about the reaction the respondent would expect from other teachers in his school if this teacher were to ask for active collaboration of others in helping him in three specified ways to

improve his teaching. (The items of the three tests are given in Appendix 1.)

We then conducted an analysis of the data taken from these three tests to determine their interaction. Our method was that of multidimensional scaling -- specifically, the computer program MINISSA-I(M) of Guttman and Lingoes.*

* For documentation on the MINISSA program, see references given in Chapter 5 of Runkel, Wyant, Bell, and others (1975).

In each of the four years in which we collected data, the multidimensional analysis divided the schools clearly into two groups. The first group of schools scored much higher on communication during emotion than did the second group. Over the years, mean scores on communication during emotion in the first group ranged from the mean of the district as a whole to one-and-a-half standard deviations above the mean. In the second group, in contrast, means over the years ranged from the mean of the district to one standard deviation below the mean. Further, we found a relation -- not a simple one -- between communicating during emotion and readiness to collaborate with other teachers in improving one's teaching. In the first group, the means over the years in responsiveness (readiness to collaborate) among schools that had received OD consultation and training ranged between seven-tenths and eight-tenths of a standard deviation above the mean of the district; but in the second group, the means of other OD-trained schools ranged from three-tenths to eight-tenths below the mean. (The means of untrained schools fell between these ranges.) In other words, in schools that reacted to OD training by expecting persistence in

communicating during emotion, readiness to take active steps in collaboratively improving teaching also was high. But among those schools where persistence in communicating during emotion was below average, so was the expectation that teachers could collaborate actively with others.

Mere openness of communication (Test B) did not have as strong effect on responsiveness as did communication during emotion. Moreover, the effect was upside-down! Schools in the second group were generally higher on openness that schools in the first group, but, as we have seen, OD-trained schools in the second group were well below average in responsiveness, while OD-trained schools in the first group were higher than average in responsiveness

The story here is that communication during emotion is much more important than mere openness of communicative channels in developing expectations of collaboration among teachers. In fact, in these schools, open communication without sufficient persistence of communication during emotion actually did more harm than good! Furthermore, it turned out that readiness to communicate during emotion could be ascertained through a few simple questions asked of the staff.

We were able to strengthen this finding by analyzing the results given by three somewhat parallel tests built from items that were available in three of the four years of data collection. The results were similar to those given by the first three tests. Details are available in Chapter 5 of Runkel, Wyant, Bell, and others (1975).

We now turn to our second example.

Amount of Training

Another question often discussed is whether a little OD training is better than none. Or, in a more sophisticated form: how much OD training is worth doing? Our data, taken from about a dozen trained schools and about thirty untrained schools for comparison, give us this answer: if a school won't give you about four days for its initial training, don't do any at all.

One of our colleagues, Spencer Wyant, examined the effects of differential amounts of training on three measures of communication. Using items on a questionnaire administered over two years he built three tests.

Test I: Communication during emotion. In this test the respondent estimated colleagues' communicative behavior in situations such as making public one's personal pain and critical opinions, and intervening in an argument between two staff members. Test I has the same title as test A in our previous example because of its strong similarity to that test.

Test II: Procedures in meetings. In this test the respondent reported how typical were situations and events that facilitated or hindered the exchange of information in faculty meetings.

Test III: Effectiveness in meetings. In this test the respondent reported how typical were situations or events in faculty meetings that indicated productivity at the meetings. (The items of Tests I, II, and III are given in Appendix 2.)

In his analysis of the data, Wyant compared the scores of

trained schools with untrained in such a way as to examine the effects of different amounts of training. He found that small amounts of training -- between six hours and approximately 22 hours -- seemed to depress the schools' scores on all three tests in comparison to the scores of schools that had received no training at all. This depressant effect was particularly apparent on Test I -- communication during emotion -- the same skill that seemed so critical in obtaining collaborative expectations among a staff in our first example. When the amount of training was greater than about 27 hours, however, scores on all three tests rose above the mean of untrained schools.

Apparently, small amounts of training merely serve to bring problems to the surface and to make staff members more cognizant of the problems that presumably exist in their schools; but small amounts of training are not sufficient to enable a staff to deal with the problems constructively. In contrast, at some point between 22 to 27 hours, the training starts to be effective in helping the staff devise new patterns of interaction that facilitate open and constructive communication of valid and important information.

In practical terms, this result means that the isolated two-day workshops that are only too common in laboratory training for organization development will probably have moderately destructive results. Assuming that the typical day of training is six hours long, our findings indicate that at least four days of training (24 hours) is necessary to open an effective program of organizational development, and that a full five-day (30 hours) or more is strongly preferable.

Again, the moral is that you can do more harm than good if you ignore an indicator of readiness -- in this case, the readiness of the school, at the outset, to devote enough time to its training. We turn now to our third example.

Effects of Types of Innovation

Still another question often discussed is whether innovative schools get that way simply by trying hard. We often hear schools characterized as "innovative" without any intimation that the kind of innovation might have anything to do with it. Our data suggest that schools differ in the kind of innovation they are ready for, and that OD training can help a school get ready for the more difficult kinds of organizational innovation. A better form of the question is: what kinds of innovation are likely to lead to what kinds of further innovation? In bringing up this question, we are urging the consultant to look at the innovative history of the school, with special attention to the difficulty of the innovations, in an organizational sense, that the school has been attempting.

The bulk of our data relating to school innovations came from the following questionnaire item:

> How about recent changes that could have useful effects on your school? Have there been any innovations, any new ways of doing things, that began during the last year or two that you think could have helpful effects in the school?

Pass out handout about here

We provided space for the respondent to write in as many as four innovations. We used this item to ascertain the awareness or beliefs among school staffs about the different sorts of "new" and "useful" things going on in their schools. Obviously, the responses contained a mixture of what staff members experienced themselves and what they heard about, as well as, a mixture of what they thought was going on and what was actually going on.

Late in 1970, long after we had ceased our interventions in the district near Seattle, we examined the data from twelve elementary schools and categorized the responses into five categories. The letter-labels and word-labels introduced here will be used frequently throughout the presentation.

A: Structural. This first category contains those changes in the school's way of working that we believe put the greatest amount of stress on the organizational fabric. These are changes that require reallocations of duties in many parts of the school. Some examples include institutionalized group problem solving, rearrangements of power, evaluations of programs, program planning and budgeting, organizational development, and new school-wide norms for communication, as well as specific new organizational structures.

B: Collaboration in the classroom. Next most stressful is the sort of new practice that affects fewer parts of the school -- perhaps only a cluster of teachers. The prime example is team teaching. Another is the new kind of relation between teacher and students that can be engendered by teaching the teacher the Flanders' method of interaction analysis.

C: Curriculum. We put into this category all sorts of packaged curricula and other ways of managing instruction: new math, remedial reading, new schedules, inquiry training, ability grouping, clustering grade levels, testing or screening students, and the like.

D: Cloistered innovations. Here we put innovations that can take place out of sight of most teachers: new methods of bookkeeping or managing finances, changes in buildings or equipment, and sending a few persons off to brief training to upgrade their skills.

N: Nothing. This category included the school's staff who mentioned nothing in answer to the question. It was used to indicate the lack of innovation in a school, or the lack of anything very many staff thought was useful.

In summary, we have five categories representing a presumably ordered sequence from the most difficult (category A) to the least (category N).

Using the number of times each type of innovation was mentioned, we rank ordered the categories of innovations for each school in a given year. Each school can be represented by an array of category-letters alone. For example, the array BCADN indicates that category B was mentioned most, category C next, category A third, category D the least among actual innovations, and even fewer respondents than that named nothing. In Table 1 (handout) we have displayed the rank-ordered arrays of the innovation categories for each school in the Kent district over the four years of the study.

Looking at Table 1, we see several patterns worth noting. First, schools generally meander, in their reports of greatest

frequency, from one innovation to another. Second, there was a flurry of collaborative innovations (B). In the middle of this study, the schools in this district were being pressed both by national trends and by their own administrators to undertake collaborative innovations such as team teaching, differentiated staffing, and the like. Table 1 shows that when schools undertook innovative efforts toward these collaborative modes of functioning (the B-innovations), most did not continue that kind of effort for longer than one year. Of the four that did continue through more than one year (schools 05, 08, 10, 11), two (05, 11) had received some OD training, and these were the two that actually succeeded at collaboration according to our criteria.

When schools relinquished efforts toward collaboration (the B-innovations), they did not typically then move into the harder realm of structural innovation (A-innovations). Only three schools (02, 10, 12) made the attempt. Two of them (02 and 10) moved into structural innovation for one year (02 weakly) and then quickly moved into the easier C-innovations. The third school (12) was the school that had received the largest amount of OD training; it moved into structural innovation and stayed there through our last assessment in 1972; furthermore, our criteria tell us that this school, too, was successful in establishing collaborative functioning and structure. Only three schools (05, 11, 12) succeeded in establishing collaborative functioning and structure, though all twelve tried to do so, and these three were the three that had received OD training during their efforts.

Of the seven schools that tried the collaborative (B) innovations for one year only, we have mentioned one (02) that tried

structural (A) innovation; this school did not receive training until after the events we are describing.

The remaining six schools, none of which received any OD training, did not toy with structural innovation (A). In the years after their unsuccessful efforts toward collaboration (B), three of them (03, 04, 07) turned to curricular (C) innovation and never returned to the more difficult sorts. The other three (01, 06, 09) gave up serious efforts toward innovation (indicated by putting lack of innovation -- N -- in first rank). Only one (06) of these three managed to put even curricular (C) innovations in first rank during the last year of our assessment.

In brief, all these twelve schools told us that their biggest innovative effort in 1968 or 69 was toward collaborative functioning, but only three actually achieved it. Those three were the three that had received OD training before or during their innovative effort. Seven schools (counting school 02, which briefly and weakly tried structural innovation before turning to curricular) stayed with the collaborative effort only one year, failed, and then either turned to curricular (C) innovation or gave up any serious effort toward innovation. Two other schools stayed with the collaborative effort longer than one year, failed, and then turned to curricular innovation.

We conclude: (1) the more difficult organizational changes (A and B) will usually require outside help, (2) if a school fails in its collaborative efforts (B), it will not then usually try the still more difficult structural (A) innovations, but (3) even if a school

fails in collaborative innovation (B), it may still be ready to undertake the less difficult curricular innovations. These findings seem to us useful admonitions to the consultant.

The data described so far do not directly say that a school can use an unsuccessful experience with collaborative innovation upon which to build a successful curricular innovation -- we have no evidence on how successful these twelve schools were in their curricular innovations. However, we have two other sources of data that do support this interpretation that an unsuccessful effort at collaborative innovation can lead to successful curricular innovation.

The first source is a study conducted in a school district that was undertaking to install a Program Planning and Budgeting system. Dr. Harry Wolcott has reported to us informally that the PPB system as a whole did not take hold, but that many teachers stated on questionnaires or in formal meetings that they found certain of the techniques valuable aids in curricular planning and intended to continue using them. In fact, many teachers came to speak of the project in its later stages as one of curricular revision and planning. This example seems to us a case of organizational (type A or B) innovation, with the more difficult type fading out but with the curricular part of it continuing.

The second corroborating study was one by Donald G. Murray (1973). He studied two schools, both of which undertook to adopt multiunit structure and attendant curricular changes. The study was summarized in the book Consultation for Innovative Schools by Schmuck, Murray, Schwartz, Smith, and Runkel; they described the outcomes in the

two schools as follows (pp. 360-361):

> At Spartan, staff members became deeply immersed in the OD consultation during the initial year of the project. In contrast, the Palmer staff was trying out a completely new [curricular] structure [simultaneously] with team teaching and individualized instruction. It is relevant to note that Spartan staff members experienced success with their problem-solving activities toward the end of the first year, while the Palmer staff did not; also, the multiunit structure itself -- with its special social-psychological attributes -- was discussed much more within the Spartan problem-solving groups than in the Palmer problem-solving groups. Premature attempts to unitize at Palmer decreased the teachers' feelings of efficacy; they frequently mentioned concerns about following through on commitments to colleagues and on not working closely enough with students....
>
> The Palmer staff's rapid attempts to implement the unitized structure... combined with an absence of formal procedures for managing cross-unit tensions, brought about high amounts of organizational stress. To complicate matters, Palmer staff members viewed early attempts by the OD consultants to work on interpersonal tensions as a waste of valuable time. After all, the Palmer staff members said, we have a job to do -- to establish instructional goals,

to develop curriculum, and to agree on our instructional procedures -- why should we spend time on the discussion of norms, skills, and procedures? Rather than working so early on designing curriculum innovations, we now believe that the consultation during the initial year at Palmer should have emphasized the problems the staff was confronting with interpersonal collaboration and procedures. The frustrations at Palmer are examples of taking action toward innovative educational proceudres before the staff has developed clear understandings and procedures for collaborative work.

> In other words, *early* attempts at [curricular] consultation at Palmer did not provide the same benefits as *later* [curricular] consultation at Spartan. Our recommendation is that OD consultation should precede efforts to bring about [curricular] change. We see the optimum period of change as occurring over a two-year period. OD consultation would be emphasized during the first year, while revisions in curriculum, instruction, and evaluation would be emphasized during the second year.

These two studies provide cross-validation for the data from Kent. The cumulated evidence argues that a school contemplating

curricular innovation will heighten its chances of success if it first gives staff members practice in new norms and skills for the collaboration that will be necessary to the innovation's success. Just how participation in structural or collaborative work helps a staff to get ready for curricular innovation is not yet clear. Perhaps some practice in making organizational adjustments, even when they are not wholly successful, can make a staff more confident that they know how to get off to a good start with a somewhat less stressful innovation. It is also possible that a project in organizational change heightens the awareness of staff about curricular changes they would like to make and about the steps available to set them in motion. Perhaps the discussions of curriculum that go on during efforts to make a structural or a collaborative innovation, whether or not the innovation is successful, lay the groundwork for later curricular changes. Or perhaps, the very process of dealing with a more difficult innovation creates new patterns of communication, increases the climate of cooperation and mutual responsibility, and these in turn are beneficial to a staff in implementing later innovations.

Summary

We have given three examples of assessments useful in diagnosis. Our first example suggests diagnosis to ascertain the level of willingness in a school to persist in communication despite emotional arousal. With this condition present, the consultant can expect OD training to improve readiness for collaborative action; without it, OD training -- at least in small to moderate amounts -- is likely to do more harm than good. Our second example suggests ascertaining carefully the amount of initial training to which a school is willing to commit itself. If it is willing to undertake four days or more, the likelihood of its showing a profit is good; if less, the likelihood is poor. Our third example suggests examining previous efforts at innovation in the school. If the school has not tried difficult organizational change, it is treading a very risky path to do so without outside consultant help. If it has tried collaborative organizational change, then it may still be ready for curricular change even if it has failed the effort toward collaboration.

We hope others will join us in the effort to improve the dimensions and methods for diagnosis available to the OD consultant.

References

Schmuck, Richard A., Donald Murray, Mary Ann Smith, Mitchell Schwartz, and Margaret Runkel. Consultation for innovative schools: OD for multiunit structure. Eugene, Oregon: CEPM, 1975.

Runkel, Philip J., Spencer Wyant, Warren Bell, and others. Self-renewal in a school district (tentative title; final report to the NIE on component 1 of contract NEC-00-0083). Eugene, Oregon: CEPM, 1975.

Runkel, Philip J. Conditions for success and failure of organizational development in schools. Paper presented at session 2.07 of the convention of the AERA, 16 April 1974. ERIC order number ED 088 242.

Handout for paper on

"Some Conditions Affecting Organizational Processes in Schools"

by

P. J. Runkel and W. E. Bell for AERA session 6.13, 1975.

Table 1. Rank-Ordered Arrays of Innovation Categories Mentioned in Elementary Schools in Kent.

School Number	Earlier Years	First occurrence of A or B innovations in first rank position	Later Years		
05**		BCNDA	B(CD)NA*	BNCDA	NCBAD*
08		BDNCA	B(DN(CA	BNCDA	CNDBA
10		BNCDA	BNDCA	ABC(DN)	CABND
11**	(New in '69)	BCDNA*	BCDNA	CANDB*	
02		(BD)(CN)A	(ACN)BD	CNBAD	CB(AN)D*
12**	(New in '69)	B(DC)AN	(AB)(CN)D*	ADCNB*	
03	NC(BD)A	B(CD)NA	CD(BN)A	NB(CD)A	
04		BNCDA	CDBNA	CD(BN)A	C(AD)BN
07	NCDBA	BCAND	CBNAD	NCDAB	
01	NB(CD)A	B(ACN)D	NC(AB)D	NA(BCD)	
06	NCBDA	BNDCA	NBCDA	CBADN	
09	NBCDA	BND(CA)	(ND)(BC)A	NCBAD	

Parentheses indicate that the categories enclosed in them are tied on the number of times being mentioned.

A= Structural, B= Collaborative, C= Curriculum, D= Cloistered, N= Nothing.

* This school received OD training between this questionnaire administration and the time of the previous one.

** This school was judged as successful in implementing a B innovation as measured by responses to interviews in 1972.

Appendix 1

Items for Test A, B, and C

Test A: Communication During Emotion

Item 1. Suppose Teacher X feels hurt and "put down" by something another teacher has said to him. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your school be likely to tell the other teacher that they felt hurt and put down?

( ) Yes, I think most would.
( ) Maybe about half would.
( ) No; most would not.
( ) I don't know.

Item 2. Suppose you are in a committee meeting with Teacher X and the other members begin to describe their personal feelings about what goes on in the school; Teacher X listens to them and tells them his own feelings. How would you feel toward X?

( ) I would approve strongly.
( ) I would approve mildly or some.
( ) I wouldn't care one way or the other.
( ) I would disapprove mildly or some.
( ) I would disapprove strongly.

Item 3. Suppose a teacher (let's call him or her Teacher X) is present when two others get into a hot argument about how the school is run. If teachers you know in your school were in Teacher X's place, what would most of them be likely to do? Would they try to help each one in the argument to understand the viewpoint of the other?

( ) Yes, I think most would.
( ) Maybe about half would.
( ) No; most would not do this.
( ) I don't know.

Item 4. Suppose you are in a committee meeting with Teacher X and the other members begin to describe their personal feelings about what goes on in the school; Teacher X quickly suggests that the committee get back to the topic and keep the discussion objective and impersonal. How would you feel toward X?

( ) I would approve strongly.
( ) I would approve mildly or some.
( ) I wouldn't care one way or the other.
( ) I would disapprove mildly or some.
( ) I would disapprove strongly.

Test B: Openness of Interpersonal Channels

Item 1. Suppose Teacher X strongly disagrees with something B says at a staff meeting. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your school seek out B to discuss the disagreements?

( ) Yes, I think most would do this.
( ) Maybe about half would do this.
( ) No; most would not.
( ) I don't know.

Items 2 and 3. Perhaps there are some people in your organization with whom you talk rather frequently about matters important to you. Please think of people with whom you talk seriously about things important to you, inside or outside formal meetings, once a week or more on the average. Write their names below. (If there are fewer than six people with whom you talk once a week about matters important to you, write down only as many as there are; if none, write "none." If there are more than six, list just the six with whom you feel your conversations are the most satisfying.)

Item 2 was the mean number of persons named in response to the above question by teachers-and-others in the school.

Item 3 was the mean number of persons named in response to the above question by the principal of the school.

Test C: Responsiveness

Item 1. Suppose Teacher X wants to improve his classroom effectiveness. If X asked another teacher to observe his teaching and then to have a conference about it afterward, how would you feel toward X?

( ) I would approve strongly.
( ) I would approve mildly or some.
( ) I wouldn't care one way or the other.
( ) I would disapprove mildly or some.
( ) I would disapprove strongly.

Item 2: Suppose Teacher develops a particularly useful and effective method for teaching something. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your school describe it briefly at a faculty meeting and offer to meet with others who wanted to hear more about it?

( ) Yes, I think most would do this.
( ) Maybe about half would do this.
( ) No; most would <u>not</u>.
( ) I don't know.

Item 3. Suppose Teacher X wants to improve his classroom effectiveness. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your building ... ask another teacher to observe his teaching and then have a conference afterward?

( ) Yes, I think most would do this.
( ) Maybe about half would do this.
( ) No; most would <u>not</u>.
( ) I don't know.

Appendix 2

Items for Test I, II, and III

Test I: Communication During Emotion

Item 1. Suppose Teacher X feels hurt and "put down" by something another teacher has said to him. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your school be likely to tell the other teacher that they felt hurt and put down?

1 No; most would not do this.
2 Maybe about half would .
3 Yes, I think most would.
Omit I don't know.

Item 2. Suppose Teacher X strongly disagrees with something B says at a staff meeting. In Teacher X's place, would most of the teachers you know in your school seek out B to discuss the disagreement?

1 No; most would not do this.
2 Maybe about half would.
3 Yes, I think most would.
Omit I don't know.

Item 3. Suppose a teacher (let's call him or her Teacher X) is present when two others get into a hot argument about how the school is run. If teachers you know in your school were in Teacher X's place, what would most of them be likely to do? Would they try to help each one in the argument understand the viewpoint of the other?

1 No; most would not do this.
2 Maybe about half would.
3 Yes, I think most would.
Omit I don't know.

The remaining 23 items on Tests I, II, and III all refer to meetings of staff members. The wording of the item stem and the response categories were as follows:

The philosopher Martin Buber once said, "All life is meeting." No matter how that statement makes you feel, you will probably agree that school systems hold a lot of meetings, and that much depends on their quality. Please think specifically of some series of meetings: either meetings of the entire faculty of your building (staff meetings) or meetings in which only a part of the faculty meets (committee meetings). Name of the meeting you are considering: _____

0 Staff or faculty meeting
1 Departmental meeting
2 Grade level meeting
3 Meeting of department heads
4 Meeting of district personnel
5 Committee meetings
6 Team teachers
8 Other

Now please consider what usually or typically happens in this meeting. For each of the items below, put one of the following numbers:

5 This is very typical of this meeting; it happens repeatedly.
4 This is fairly typical of this meeting; it happens quite often.
3 This is more typical than not but it doesn't happen a lot.
2 This is more untypical than typical, though it does happen some.
1 This is quite untypical; it rarely happens.
0 This is not typical at all; it never happens.

The respondent was asked to answer the following subitems about his/her school's meetings.

Item 4. People are afraid to be openly critical or to make good objections.

5 not typical at all
4 quite untypical
3 more untypical than typical
2 more typical than not
1 fairly typical
0 very typical

Item 5. People hesitate to give their true feelings about problems which are discussed.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 6. People give their real feelings regarding what is happening during the meeting itself.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Test II: Procedures in Meetings

Item 1. Length of typical meeting.

0 Typical meeting lasts 0-15 minutes.
1 16-30 min. (or half-hour)
2 31-45 min. (or three-quarters of an hour)
3 46-60 min. (or one hour)
4 61-90 min. (or hour and a quarter of and a half)
5 91-120 min. (or two hours)
6 121-150 min. (or two-and-a-half hours)
7 151-180 min. (or three hours)
8 More than 180 minutes (more than three hours)

Item 2. The group discusses the pros and cons of several different alternate solutions to a problem.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Item 3. The same few people seem to do most of the talking during the meeting.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 4. There is a good deal of jumping from topic to topic -- it's often unclear where tne group is on the agenda.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 5. The same problems seem to keep coming up over and over again from meeting to meeting.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Item 6. When the group is supposedly working on a problem, it is really working on some other "under the table" problem.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 7. There are splits or deadlocks between factions or subgroups.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Test III: Effectiveness in Meetings

Item 1. When problems come up in the meeting, they are thoroughly explored until everyone understands what the problem is.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Item 2. There is a tendency to propose answers without really having thought the problem and its causes through carefully.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 3. People bring up extraneous or irrelevant matters.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 4. Decisions are often left vague -- as to what they are, and who will carry them out.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 5. People do not take the time to really study or define the problem they are working on.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 6. When a decision is made, it is clear who should carry it out, and when.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Item 7. People don't seem to care about the meeting, or want to get involved in it.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 8. When a group is thinking about a problem, at least two or three different solutions are suggested.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Item 9. The results of the group's work are not worth the time it takes.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 10. People feel very committed to carrying out the solutions arrived at by the group.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all

Item 11. Solutions and decisions are in accord with the chairman's or leader's point of view, but not necessarily with the member's.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 12. The discussion goes on and on without any decision being reached.

5 not typical at all
to
0 very typical

Item 13. People feel satisfied or positive during the meeting.

5 very typical
to
0 not typical at all